New World Order

Philosophy Forums Society, Government, and Economics

daniel j lavender Jul 2023

New World Order
Daniel J. Lavender

The “New World Order” is defined as a “secretly emerging totalitarian world government” (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_World_Order_(conspiracy_theory) 1) system. It is often viewed as a system of the future.

That is precisely the issue.

Viewing the New World Order or global system as some future event, as something to be prevented, obscures the fact that the issue exists now.

The economy and government have been globally linked for decades. Look around. Anyone with any sense can easily observe this.

The economy is globally linked. Commerce is globally linked. Communication is globally linked. The internet is globally linked. Government is globally linked.

However many are stuck in the antiquated nation-state mentality. They are stuck in the old national philosophy. This is understandable, after all, many have much invested in it. Many fought wars to support it. Many died in its supposed defense.

Nevertheless the system is now globally linked. World leaders, perhaps better known as the global elite, are globally linked. Commerce, the economy, technology is essentially globally linked. But the actual people are not.

Many remain loyal to the old nation-state mentality. The commoners, the soldiers, the workers, the majority largely retain this mentality. However the global elite, the ownership and administrative class, have adopted a new global perspective. While the commoners were occupied in the mines, on the battlefields and in the offices the elite were busy crafting a new global infrastructure. They now operate on a global level while most others still operate on a national one.

Although the global system has been adopted it has not been announced. At least not overtly. For one, any public attempt to do so would be met with great hostility. As stated previously, many people have much invested in the old-world mentality. Thousands died in battle to preserve national sovereignty. For this reason and others the new global network is guarded and kept quiet amongst the global elite.

The global elite benefit greatly from this arrangement. The masses, stuck in the old nationalistic mentalities, view other nationalities as opponents, as enemies. The masses continue to compete amongst themselves, amongst their nations. These competitions are battles. Battles fueled by global corporations in the global economy. Warring nations require armaments, and those armaments are supplied by said corporations. At a price.

War is certainly profitable for the elite. It generates money for corporations and banks. But war also thins the global population leaving more resources for the victors. And the victors are always the global elite, those with enough wealth and administrative clout to avoid the tragedies of war altogether.

It’s analogous to the National Football League. The players, the soldiers, fight tooth and nail on the battlefield for survival while the owners, the global elite, watch comfortably from their air-conditioned booths. If the owners convinced the players not to compete would they make any money? Would they even have a league?

World leaders are effectively channeling this old-world, nationalistic philosophy to their advantage. Their new global network and perspective allows them to handily exploit those retaining the old nationalistic perspective. Not much theatre is required to maintain the ploy. Many are so entrenched in the old-world nationalism that they couldn’t be persuaded otherwise anyway.

World leaders act as though they are at odds, that’s part of the ploy. And in fact they do have slight skirmishes from time to time. However they are very much on the same page. Their effort is concerted. The masses, not so much.

The New World Order is not around the corner. Viewing the New World Order as such is the very issue, it is part of the strategy allowing it to succeed. It neutralizes meaningful action now by focusing on events in the future. The New World Order is already here.

Retaining the nation-state arrangement would retain the same old divisive problems. Conversely accepting a centralized, all-powerful global government would easily produce tyrannical results. The aim should be a global community of minimal government exalting the individual, not the group. It would promote freedom of the individual, responsibility of the individual and self-governance.

Note: The author does not prefer nor recommend Wikipedia as a reliable source. For purposes of this essay Wikipedia was used as Wikipedia often has the pulse of the people regarding such topics.

1 Reply

Full of sound and fury 1
AI is developing into the real enemy for the American people
Too Big To Fly

5.8k views 7 links 15 users 58 min read Top replies